

spoken would apply with greater force to one whose speech was cut short by the House rising for the day and it was his duty to be present in the House and rise in his seat when the debate was resumed.

The second question is whether he may be permitted in the circumstances of the case to make a second speech.

Rule 150(1) is clearly inapplicable. The second sentence of that rule means that when a member rises to speak and catches the Speaker's eye and is called upon to speak but some extraneous circumstance intervenes and he does not proceed to speak at that time, he will lose his chance unless the Speaker permits him to speak at a later stage. 'At a later stage' obviously means, a stage later than the one when he was called upon to speak but did not do so. It must be within the recollection of Hon'ble Members that when Sri K. Pattabhiraman and Sri T. Siddalingiah both rose to speak on the Report of the Fact Finding Committee and the Chair called upon Sri K. Pattabhiraman to speak he requested the Speaker to permit Sri T. Siddalingiah to speak first. Sri K. Pattabhiraman spoke after Sri T. Siddalingiah concluded his speech. It is such a case that falls under Rule 150(1).

It is only Rule 150(2) that would apply. There is no doubt that the Speaker has the discretion to permit a member to make a second speech. But in exercising that discretion the Speaker has to balance the claims of the member who has already spoken against the claims of all the other members of the House who have not spoken at all but may desire to do so. It is not as if this case falls under one of the exceptions I have referred to above requiring that the discretion should be exercised in favour of a second speech. This is a case where the member, no doubt due to an unfortunate set of circumstances, was not in his seat to resume his speech when the debate was resumed. I think I will be failing in my duty to the House as a whole and to those members who have yet to speak to the motion if I permitted a second speech for Sri

Channabasappa. Actually Sri Channabasappa has in all spoken for four hours on the motion for consideration. This is an important motion on which I am sure several other Hon'ble Members have yet to speak.

I have therefore come to the conclusion that by absentsing himself at the proper time Sri Channabasappa has lost his right to speak on the motion and that a second speech cannot be permitted to him.

## PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

**SECRETARY.**—As required by Rule 90-F of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Mysore Labour Housing (Amendment) Bill, 1955, as passed by the Legislative Council.

## THE MYSORE UNIVERSITY BILL, 1955.

*Motion to consider (contd.)*

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿನ್ನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೇವಲ ಎರಡು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ ಮೇಲೆ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. University Authorities ಎಂದರೆ University Senate, Syndicate ಮುಂತಾದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ non-official representation ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಈಗ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಈ Act ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ autonomy ಹಾಸ್ಟಿ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ non-official elements ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ Assembly ಮತ್ತು Councilಗೆ ಇದರ ಮೇಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುಲ್ಲ ಗೋವಿಂದರಾಜ್ ಅವರು ಸಹ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ non-official representation ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ Social Service Board. ಕೆಲವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ, practical ಆಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಎಂಬ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ)

ಯನ್ನು ಕಾಲ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅನುಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು fair trial ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಲ ದೇಶ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವವರು ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರು ಎಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಸಹ ಇಂತಹ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಆಡಳಿತ ವೆಚ್ಚವು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯೊಳಗೇ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರ್ಬರ ಜಾನ್ಸಿ ಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ University authorities ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಮೇರಿಕಾ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲ್ನಲ್ಲಿ Medium of Instruction ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದು ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಆದರೂ ಸಹ ನಾನು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪದೂರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಇಡೀ ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ common ಅಗಿ Medium of Instruction ಒಂದೇ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಹಾಗೆಂದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷ್ ಭಾಷೆಯಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜ್ಞಾನವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ತಪ್ಪೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಾತೃಭಾಷೆಯಾದ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಅಭಿಮಾನ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ, common Medium of Instruction ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅತ್ಯಾವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು Common Language ಯಾವುದು ಆಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದರೆ, ತಮಿಳು, ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಹಿಂದೀ ಭಾಷೆ, ಆದರೆ ಮೂಲಕ Medium of Instruction ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

1-30 P.M.

ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಲರ್ಹವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ವಿಶೇಷ; ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ non-lapsable grant ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ನಿಬಂಧನೆ ಅಥವಾ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿನಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವನ್ನು ಅನುಭವಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಕ್ಯಾಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗೆ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. Autonomy ಎಂದು ಏನು

ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಮೇಲೆ ಹತೋಟಿಯುಳ್ಳ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು visitorial powers ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು 9ನೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೇ ಎಂಬ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

\*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the purpose of this Bill is to bring about the reorganisation of the University. This was long overdue, because the University in its history of forty years has grown by leaps and bounds. In the words of the Education Minister :

“In the forty years of its existence the University has gone on expanding by leaps and bounds. At present we have 41 colleges in all with a student strength of over 20,000. Of the existing colleges, nineteen are managed directly by the University, four by Government and eighteen by private bodies.”

Further, the number of students the number of teachers that are in the University and the number of colleges that are run by the University and the places in which these colleges have been working are so widespread that it has become difficult for a department of the Government to run this University. In the words of Dr. C. R. Reddy :

“This is not a question of a dogma or a religious principle. Experience has shown, as Lord Bryce put it, that even when the States Fund Universities and Finance Universities, the management and administration is best left to autonomous corporations reserving to themselves visitorial powers to be exercised exceedingly rarely, and under the most compelling necessity.”

Again, he has stated :

“If the Secretariat should administer the University, then why have a University? Have another D.P.I. or some one

analogous. To constitute a University and deprive it of the right to lead a constitutional life through exercise of the secular and financial powers of Government is self-contradiction which leads to self-stultification all round.

“A University should therefore be autonomous though it may be held responsible by ultimate visitatorial jurisdiction.”

Certain provisions that are adumbrated in this Bill are really progressive. But there are certain provisions which are repugnant to the very idea of the autonomy of the University. For example, a Social Service Board is to be constituted and compulsory free social service is expected of every University student who is anxious to have a degree; to get it confirmed he should undergo this free and compulsory social service. This is a peculiar compulsion that has been adumbrated in this Bill. This is peculiar to the Mysore University and nowhere in India a measure of this nature has been included. Even in the recent University Act that was passed by the Tirupathi University, this has not been included as one of the compulsory items that a University student should undergo before he is entitled to get a degree confirmed on him by the University.

Sir, the Minister for Education has stated :

“University autonomy covers three fields: academic freedom, financial freedom and administrative freedom.”

By imposing this free and compulsory social service to be undergone by a student aspiring to get a degree from the University, the Government have transgressed the limits and have interfered in the internal affairs of the University. The constitution of the Social Service Board is entirely independent of the University. The University will have nothing to do with the constitution. They will not have any say in the constitution. Who should form the members of this Board is left entirely to the sweet will and

whims of the Government. In Chapter 5 of the Bill, it says :

“Powers of the Social Service Board.—(1) The Social Service Board shall have—(a) power to enforce compulsory and free social service from students of the University required to render social service under clause (m) of Section 17 for such period not exceeding one year as may be prescribed by rules made by the said Board;”

The rules that are going to be framed and the way in which or how the student should undergo this social service training is entirely left to this Board and the University has no say in the matter. One can understand that there is some force or meaning if the University under this Bill was asked to form a Social Service Board and if this social service training is to be undergone under the direction and under the immediate supervision of the Social Service Board under the University. Further, if the social service training that is expected of the student is in line with the training that he undergoes in the university, one can understand. For example if an engineer is asked to work in a project or an engineer who has undergone training in electricity is asked to work in an electrical project or in an electrical station or a doctor is asked to work in a hospital or a lawyer is asked to work freely in a legal advisory bureau, there would have been some force and nobody would have raised an objection to such an imposition of compulsory social service training on the student. Further according to Section 31, it has been made compulsory on a University student to render free social service. I am afraid that it is difficult and that it is not reasonable to expect free social service from the students of the University. During the period of training, they should be paid a subsistence allowance. Otherwise, it will lead to slave labour of which we are so critical. If the entire social service training is left to a Social Service Board outside the University and under the direction of the Government, it is quite possible that the training that is going to be

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)  
imparted to these students may be undertaken by a non-University body and an organisation outside the Government and at that a non-official organisation like the Bharat Seva Dal, where it is imputed and rightly that political motives are involved. Sir, it will be repugnant and pernicious that such a feature should be allowed in this Bill. I therefore, earnestly request that the Government should delete Chapter V altogether from this Bill.

Sir, there are really some progressive steps that the Government have taken in formulating this Bill which has been placed before us. The autonomy that the Government wants to give to the University deserves recognition and congratulation from us. But there are snags here and there regarding the constitution of several University authorities. In certain respects, the constitution of several University authorities under the present University Act are more progressive than what is allowed under the present Bill and what was suggested by the Education Reforms Committee in Mysore. For example, the constitution of the Senate under the present Bill is retrograde in that the elected element is going to be reduced from what it is under the present Act and what was proposed under the Educational Reforms Committee. Sir, the elected element that was given to the Legislature has been reduced to such an extent that it is unthinkable why the official element in the present constitution of the Senate should be so high. When we are making the University autonomous and when we are making huge sums of money to be made available and that too non-lapsable for the utilisation of the University, is it not desirable that the elected element in the University authorities should have a predominant say? I have suggested certain amendments also for the constitution of the Senate. There should be proper representation in the Senate for teachers as well. Sir, many a time it so happens that the professors that are acting already on the Senate may not voice the aspirations or may not safeguard the interests of the teachers in

the University. Is it not desirable, Sir, that these teachers who form major part of the University should have a say in the affairs of the Senate and therefore should have adequate representation in the Senate?

The registered graduates under the present Act are empowered to send about six representatives of theirs to the Senate. Under the present Bill, the Government do not seem to have given any better advantage to the registered graduates. The number of registered graduates is day by day increasing. When we are thinking of making democratic institutions and when we are thinking that these institutions should be governed democratically, is it not our duty that the registered graduates should have some say in these matters and that they should have adequate representation?

And again, Sir, the definition of the registered graduate is also very narrow. According to the present system, any graduate who has passed his B.A. or B.Sc., degree, who has taken a degree five years before the date of application for the registration should be registered as a registered graduate. This is very undemocratic. And in certain Universities, as far as I know, that when a graduate takes his degree at the convocation he is automatically enrolled as a registered graduate. Therefore the definition as it is found in the present Bill needs to be amended so that all graduates who take their degrees at the convocation should be registered as registered graduates and in turn they should be allowed to send their representatives in greater number than what has been provided at present.

There are certain elements in the University, for example, there are certain departments—Telugu Department or the Tamil Department or Hindi Department; they do not get proper recognition by way of representation in the Senate which is an important body which conducts the affairs of the University. In the Thirupathi University Act, they have made provisions for representation of these departments—Telugu, Tamil, Kannada and Hindi Departments, in



the Senate. The same privilege or the same right should be endowed to these departments.

Coming to the constitution of the Syndicate, here also they have made certain changes in the University. A suggestion was put forth by Sri. Imam that the representation of the vacancies that is given to the professorial elements in the University is too much and he quoted that Dr. Reddy was against giving any representation to the professorial elements. But here also the elected element is being reduced.

The Syndicate is a very important body in the University, it is the governing body; it must administer the University in day to day affairs and therefore the constitution of the Syndicate should be so adjusted that the elected elements should predominate.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Is the representation analogous to the present representation or is it different?

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.**—In certain ways it is analogous.

The Syndicate shall consist of the following members, *viz.*, the Vice-Chancellor, the Director of Public Instruction, the Principal of Maharaja's College, the Principal of Central College, four Principals of other Colleges, to be nominated by the Chancellor.

Powers of the Syndicate. The administration of the University including the general superintendence and control over the institutions of the University shall be vested in the Syndicate and for that purpose the Syndicate shall have the following powers:—

Under the present Act there were six non-official members. Under the proposed constitution of the Syndicate only there are 3 members. We are making some departure from the present Act. From the present Act it is seen that the Government have over-all control over the University. Now we are making the University an autonomous body, it is but right that the elected element should have more representation in the Syndicate. I have suggested certain amendments to this also which I will take up when it comes before this House.

Regarding the Academic Council, certain important changes have been made and more powers have been conferred on the Academic Council. So far the decisions of the Academic Council were more or less representative or recommendatory and now the decisions of the Academic Council will have a binding on the University and they have broadened the constitution of the Academic Council; they are giving more powers and they are giving more representation to the teachers. Three teachers of University Colleges other than persons who are ex-officio members are elected from among those ten teachers other than persons who are ex-officio members elected from among themselves. Here I feel that the representation that they are going to give to the affiliated colleges appears to be more than the representation that they are going to give to the teachers of the University colleges. It would have been better if there was some balance between these two. Here also in the Academic Council, Professors who hold or who happen to be the heads of departments will find a place in the Academic Council. But there are certain departments in the Mysore University; unfortunately no professorship has been created in those departments. It is long overdue that the University should create professorship in Tamil, in Telugu and some other departments. At present Assistant Professors are holding these posts and according to the present Bill they have no place in the Academic Council. They should also be given proper representation. I therefore suggest that suitable amendment may be made so that adequate representation to these departments where Assistant Professors hold the posts of Head of the Department may be given representation.

Much controversy was raised regarding the funds or grants made over by the Government to the University. It is good that the Government have decided, according to the Bill, that they are going to make non-lapsable lumpsum grant to the University, consisting of an amount equal to the average of the grant made to the University for a period of three years

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)  
immediately preceding the commencement of this Act, and in respect of Government colleges transferred to the University under Section 5, an amount equal to the net expenditure incurred by the Government for that college during the year preceding such transfer.

Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, Government have stated that the average grant to the University for the years 1952-53, 1953-54 and 1954-55 is Rs. 45,33,000. I know that in some years Government did make more grants than the average that has been worked out. Unfortunately due to the laxity or due to the inefficiency of the then administration, they have allowed certain sums to lapse. And I therefore suggest that the average that has been worked out will not be sufficient for running the University on a more profitable basis, profitable in the sense that sufficient amounts to be spent for research and other development activities of the University would not be available. I suggest that instead of making the average grant on the three years basis it should be doubled or at least one and a half times the grant that was being made for the last three years to the University should be given.

Government have stated in section 38 clause (b) of the Bill—

“If the Government after such enquiry as it deems fit is satisfied that there is a reduction or increase in the expenditure of the University in any year, it may reduce or increase the grant, as the case may be.”

When once a bulk grant is made over to the University, I know that is going to be non-lapsable and the Government will not have any claim on the funds; but for the next year when the question of this non-lapsable grant comes up before the Government, they have taken powers under this section that enquiry might be caused and if it is found that there is reduction in the expenditure of the University, they may reduce the grant. Under no circumstances, Sir, there will be any reduction; on the other hand there

will always be an increase in the expenditure of the University. That being so, the Government will have to consider every year the question of increasing or enhancing the grant and not reducing the grant. Therefore the clause that has been put down here needs to be amended so that the Government can cause an enquiry and increase the grant if the increase in the expenditure of the University is found to be reasonable and necessary.

Sir, we are making the University an autonomous body and we are empowering the University to conduct its own affairs in the way in which it likes. I would urge that there should be certain provisions where certain things deserve to be enforced. For example, it has been put down that the University or the University authorities may allow the functioning of Unions or Associations in the interests of the University students. I feel that that should be made compulsory and it should be a statutory obligation on the part of the University authorities to have compulsory unions. I would like to read out what has been stated in the Radhakrishnan Commission Report regarding the extra curricular activities that are needed for making a university student worthy of university education.

“The extra-curricular activities of the college provide avenues through which students could participate in making decisions and carrying on joint undertakings. Habits of mutual trust and co-operation and qualities of fair play, patience, disinterestedness, consideration for others, are acquired through practice. Students cannot learn these if the institutions are run on authoritarian lines. We cannot teach the lessons of freedom by the methods of servitude. Students should be encouraged to participate in the social and cultural activities of the areas in which the colleges are situated so that they may become alive to the needs of the society in which they live.”

2 P.M.

This statement needs greater fulfilment especially under the circumstances that are obtaining after the dawn of independence. Before we were attuned to the democratic way of life, the teaching or the learning or the discipline or the character that was needed may not be the same for the way or the times in which we are living. Especially after the dawn of independence when we are attuned to this democratic way of life, parliamentary democracy requires that our students in the University need to be trained and it is the statutory obligations of the University to train them in the extra-curricular activities as has been recommended by the Radhakrishnan Commission. Unfortunately the University of Mysore which was once famous for its position in the All India sphere has lost some of its reputation for reasons which I need not enumerate here. University Union and College Associations were functioning very effectively and for a good purpose. I do not know what happened and why they have not been revived for some years in spite of repeated representations and demands both from the students and their well-wishers and the students' extra-curricular activities were given a go-by.

Regarding the vacancies that may arise in the Senate or in the Syndicate, certain provisions have been made. Under the existing Act, a vacancy in the Senate shall have to be filled up as follows:

“Except in such cases as are otherwise provided in the Statutes a member of the Senate shall hold his seat until the next reconstitution to the Senate or of the body he represents thereon, whichever takes place earlier.”

This provision under the existing Act was not given effect to by the present Government and by the authorities of the University, when such occasion arose. A member of the Legislative Council was elected to the University Senate. From the University Senate he was elected to the

University Council. He lost his membership of the Legislative Council and when he lost his membership of the Legislative Council automatically his membership on the University Council and also on the Senate should have ceased. But unfortunately. . .

**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO** — I submit that that point which the Hon'ble Member has raised has been examined by the Legal department. It has been found to be in order. If the Hon'ble Member wants, a separate question in some form or other can be put and I will answer that. It need not be taken up during this debate.

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY**.—I am pointing out how a gross injustice was committed.

**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO**.—My submission is, it is found to be correct and valid.

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY**.—The Constitution was blatantly violated in continuing that member to be a member of the Senate and thereby allowing him . . .

**Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY** (Bangalore South).—I rise to a point of order. The subject-matter under discussion is the present Bill of the University. My friend is taking an instance that has occurred some time ago and he is trying to argue here on that. I do not know how that is relevant to this University Bill. I want a ruling from the Chair.

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY**.—The Government have placed the University Bill before us for our consideration. This is not an amending Bill. This is a Bill which is going to replace the existing Act. They want to improve and they have improved in certain cases over some provisions that are found in the existing Act and this is a provision that was found in the existing Act. Here is a violation of the Constitution, a violation of the existing Act and they have made certain provisions in the present Bill. I do not want that such a violation should be repeated again to the disservice and to the disadvantage of others.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Supposing a single instance is taken up. It cannot be answered in this way. Therefore, if you want to improve the Bill, you can move an amendment. But if you want an answer on any particular question, say, on the conduct of the Senate or any body, you can bring it separately.

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.**—I am only questioning the University authorities or whichever authorities that are responsible for continuing the membership of that member who ceased to be a member of the Legislative Council and who then ceased to be a member of the Senate and the University Council. I am only bringing this to the notice of the Government, to the notice of the University authorities through you and to the notice of this Assembly that such a thing should not be repeated.

**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.**—That is an instance that took place some months ago. The Hon'ble Member has been a member of the Legislature all the while. Without impugning it in the proper course, to raise a debate on a point which Government holds to be quite legal and to make all these remarks, is not proper; nor is this the way of raising that question here.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—That reference need not be made here. It will not improve matters.

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.**—I am afraid it should not be repeated. For that reason I am saying this.

“(2) Any vacancy in the said membership occurring before the next reconstitution shall be filled as soon as conveniently may be, by the electorate, body or person who elected or nominated the member whose place has become vacant except as hereinafter provided, and the person so elected or nominated shall be a member only for the remaining period of the term for which the person whose place he has filled would have been a member:

“Provided that no vacancy in the said membership occurring within six months before the next

reconstitution shall be filled until such reconstitution.”

Here also I have got some objection.

“Provided that no vacancy in the said membership occurring within six months before the next reconstitution shall be filled until such reconstitution.”

For example, a meeting of the University Senate is convened within six months of the next reconstitution. When an opportunity has afforded itself and when a vacancy has occurred, why is it and what is the difficulty for the University to conduct an election for a vacancy in the Syndicate if it has occurred? Why should this time-limit be put?

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—You do not want the time-limit?

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.**—Yes.

“Provided further that if a casual vacancy arises in the membership of the Senate to be filled by the registered graduates of the University, the vacancy shall be filled by the next available candidate after the sixth who polled the next highest number of votes at the last previous general election. The person thus filling the vacancy shall be a member only for the remaining period of the term for which the person whose place he has filled would have been a member. But no such vacancy shall be filled within six months before the date of the next general reconstitution of the Senate.”

“(3) (a) No member of any authority specified in sub-section (1) who is elected, appointed or nominated in his capacity as a member of a particular electorate or body or as a teacher or where expressly stated so as the holder of a particular appointment, shall continue to be a member of the particular electorate or body or a teacher or the holder of the particular appointment.”

The reference which I made some minutes before has been improved upon. There is no ambiguity left. If a

member of the Legislative Council has been elected to the Senate and if he ceases to be a member of the Council automatically, even though there is no reconstitution of the Legislative Council which is a permanent body, (on which some shelter was taken,) according to the present clause he will cease to be a member of the Senate when once he ceases to be a member of the Legislative Council. I am glad that that lacunae has been set right. It is with a view to set right such lacuna that I was pointing out an instance which happened some time back.

Regarding eligibility for admission of students:

“Students shall not be eligible for admission to a course of study for a degree or diploma unless they possess such qualifications as may be prescribed.”

“For the educational advancement of students belonging to any socially and educationally backward classes, and the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, the Chancellor may, by rules make special provisions in respect of admissions, award of fellowships, travelling fellowships, scholarships, studentships, stipends and other facilities to such students.”

Under the Bill Government have really brought forward improvement over the prevailing position. It has been noted by all sections of the public and by many members, if not all, that there was an unsatisfactory method of admitting students especially to professional and technical colleges. Some of the members did misuse their positions of power. Many a time many people had to undergo unnecessary suffering and their privileges and rights were curtailed and they were prevented from prosecuting their studies to which they were entitled. Such an abuse of power will not be tolerated and should not be tolerated. That is going to be rectified if certain rules are framed under Clause 55 and they are given effect to. Then the University will not be the target for attack for such misuses or abuses so far known in the University life of Mysore.

Sir, I should congratulate the Government regarding certain provisions that they have included in this Bill, especially the Appointment Board. Sir, as we all know, the University Council in Mysore State has become a hot bed of politics,—communal politics. Merit was given a go-by; all sorts of considerations were given weightage; so much so, deserving candidates in the University did not receive proper recognition that was due to them. Here and there I have got to quote certain instances to justify the stand that the Government have taken in regard to certain matters in this Bill. I do not know whether some of the members are aware or not but it had appeared in papers that a Lecturer who was not even confirmed as an Assistant Professor was elevated to the position of Professorship. Again, Sir, Sri Bheemappa Naik was complaining that there was inordinate delay and there was all sort of mischief going on in the Secretariat. If this charge could be justified partly, the same charge deserves to be levelled against the University. I know in certain cases, the responsible body like the University Council made inconsistent and contradictory recommendations. At a time or at one meeting, they made a recommendation that so and so should be appointed as Professor. In the next meeting—I do not know what transformation was brought about in the minds of the Members of the University Council—that recommendation was made null and void and a new name was suggested for the same post though he was not an applicant for that post. Sir, that was the reason why there was so much of hue and cry and so much of fighting for membership of the Council. There are other instances where injustices were heaped and wrongs were done to the Members of the Staff in the University. I am glad that the place which was a hotbed of communal politics will not be so under the present Bill. It will be a separate authority and it will be one of the governing bodies which will discharge its functions fairly to the satisfaction of all. The Appointment Board under the



(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)  
 present Bill will do away with the misgivings and the mischief that was hitherto being done. It has been rightly said that this Board will function in accordance with the rules framed in consultation with the Syndicate and Public Service Commission. It is a very good and laudable clause and there should be no objection to accept this clause.

Section 57 is as follows:—

“57. Transfer of Government servants to the University.—(1) All teachers, and other employees whether permanent, temporary or on probation, or awaiting confirmation having completed their probation, employed in either constituent colleges or institutions maintained by the University or in any office of the University immediately before the date of commencement of this Act, shall be absorbed in the corresponding grade of service of the University or of the Government as may be decided upon by a Service Allocation Committee consisting of the following members, namely:—

(a) The Vice-Chancellor who shall be the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Committee;

(b) The Director of Public Instruction in Mysore;

(c) The Principal, Maharaja's College, Mysore;

(d) The Principal, Central College, Bangalore, and

(e) The Secretary to Government, Education Department.

The Registrar shall be *ex-officio* Secretary to the Committee.”

Sir, as in the previous clause with reference to the Appointment Board, it would have been better if this clause was also so drafted as to state that this Service Allocation Committee should function according to rules framed in consultation with the Syndicate and the Public Service Commission. It is quite possible. There are some misapprehensions in the minds of the members of the Teaching

staff that in some cases or on certain occasions they may not get a fair deal. In order to allay such fear, it is better that this Services Allocation Committee functions according to the Rules framed in consultation with the Syndicate and the Public Service Commission.

Sub-clause (2) says :

“Any person who feels aggrieved by the decision of the Service Allocation Committee shall have the right of making his representation, stating his grievances and his claims, to the Government through the Vice-Chancellor within twenty clear days after the receipt of the order of the Committee and the decision of the Government thereon shall be final.”

It is stated that the Rajpramukh of the State of Mysore shall be the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall also exercise such other powers as are conferred on him by this Act or by the Statutes, Ordinances, Regulations and Rules. Some Members had some misgivings about this. Those misgivings have already been cleared by some of the members who preceded me. In most of the Universities in other Provinces, the Governor of the Province is generally the Chancellor of that University. I therefore feel that there should be no objection to accept the Head of the State to be the Chancellor of the University of Mysore. Hitherto, under the present Act, correspondence or communication with the Chancellor was carried on through the Government. Under Section 62 of the present Bill it is stated :

“(1) The Rajpramukh may make rules for regulating the procedure for communication to the Chancellor of any matter under this Act and the Statutes, Ordinances, Regulations and Rules.

(2) Until rules are made under sub-section (1), the procedure and orders in force immediately before the commencement of this Act with respect to the University Act, 1933, shall continue in force with respect to the University constituted under this Act.”

It would be better if it is explicitly stated that hereafter, as soon as this Bill when passed into an Act comes into force, all communications to the Chancellor by the University shall be made directly to the Chancellor and not through the Governmental machinery. If that is adumbrated in this clause by modifying the present one, it would allay all fears that have been exercising the minds of some of the Members. Clause 8 says:

“The Chancellor may, at any time, appoint a Pro-Chancellor to exercise such powers and functions of the Chancellor as may be delegated to him by the Chancellor. The Pro-Chancellor shall, in all public functions connected with the University, take rank and precedence immediately after the Chancellor. The Pro-Chancellor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Chancellor.”

I have no reason to find fault with this clause relating to the creation of Pro-Chancellor. It may be necessary even though it need not be filled. When an emergency arises, if the vacancy like that of a Pro-Chancellor is there, it may be filled up and the activities of the University may be carried on. For example, Dr. C. R. Reddy did not come to Mysore of his own accord. He was invited by the then Government to make certain recommendations regarding the re-organisation of University, Secondary and Primary Education in the State. An eminent man of that stature, when he was invited by the Government of Mysore had to be given a certain status and designation. This particular clause under the existing Act was availed of and he was made the Pro-Chancellor of the University of Mysore. When in future such an occasion arises, this particular clause may be made use of. I therefore see no objection to the retention of this clause. Clause 9 says:

“(1) The Vice-Chancellor shall be a wholetime officer of the University.

(2) The Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor and

shall hold office during the pleasure of the Chancellor.

(3) Subject to the provisions of sub-section (2), the term of office of the Vice-Chancellor shall ordinarily be for a period of three years.”

So under the present Bill, the Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor. As has been pointed out by certain Members, in some Universities, Vice-Chancellors are elected. It does not mean that the general public in the State or in the University area are going to elect the Vice-Chancellor. A particular University authority, that too, the widest or the general body of the University Authority, for example the Senate, will elect the Vice-Chancellor of the University. The Members of the Senate are all responsible people and most of them are academic men and some of them are drawn from the public field. There is a combination or the blending of the two in a democratic set up. It is necessary that there should be a harmonious blending of the two, the academic and the non-official elements. The University is going to propose a panel of names and the Chancellor can select one from the panel as Vice-Chancellor of the University. It is true that in academic fields some people pointed out that men of eminence and academic attainment will be shy to contest any elections and it is quite possible that due to the vagaries of election an undeserving man might come up. Sir, it is equally true that, where a man is appointed as Vice-Chancellor, he may not be a man who can discharge the functions of the High Office which he holds to the satisfaction of all and he may not be quite learned and academic.

2-30 P.M.

We know that giants like Sir Brajendra Nath Seal have occupied these high and exalted places in the Mysore University. We also know that during some periods, dwarfs also have adorned that place. I therefore plead that the University Senate should be empowered to send up a panel out of which the Chancellor can select one of

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)  
them as the Vice-Chancellor of the University.

Sir, I have tabled certain amendments. When the Joint Select Committee goes through the amendments and also through the clauses of this Bill, they will certainly make and they should make suitable amendments in the light of discussions that are held. I would strongly urge that Chapter 5 with regard to the appointment of Social Service Board should be deleted from this Bill. It is going to disintegrate the University Bill which is otherwise very good. I would earnestly urge the Minister for Education to reconsider this. Government should have nothing to do with such a body. It is going to be contrary to the purpose for which they want to make this university an autonomous body. It will be repugnant and it will be pernicious.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಭೆಯಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ 3ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ (2)ರಲ್ಲಿ “The University shall have power to . . . . . grant, demise, alienate or otherwise dispose of all or any of the property, movable or immovable, belonging to the University. . . .” ಎಂದಿದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ದಾನವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಅಥವಾ ನಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ದಾನವಾಗಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾರಾಟಮಾಡಿ ಬಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ದಾನಕೊಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಆಸ್ತಿ ದಾನವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬಾರದು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿ ತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು The Board of Appointments ಎಂದು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್; ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಟಿವ್ ಪಾಲರುಗಳು, ಡೀಕನುಗಳು, ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾದವರು, ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು ಮುಂತಾದವರು ಸದಸ್ಯರು; ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಯಾದರೆ ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರ ಕೈಕೆಳಗಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎನಿಸುವವಾಗಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಯಂ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡು

ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರಿಂದ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿ ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಪರಿಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಿ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಯೋಗ್ಯರಾದವರನ್ನು ಅರ್ಹರಾದವರನ್ನು ನೌಕರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನ ಸಲಹೆ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ ಎನಿಸಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡುವಾಗಲೂ ಸಲಹೆ ಪಡೆದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ವೈಸ್ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಕೆಳಗಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಸ್ವಯಂ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರದೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದನ್ನು ಮನೂವಯಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪಾದಮಾಡಿರು. ಈಗ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನೇಕರು ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆಯೇ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಇಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ. ಯಾವ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಭಾವವಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅವರು ಉದ್ಯೋಗಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಪರಿಶ್ರಮ ಬರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಸುಮಾರು ಎರಡುಸಾವಿರ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಒಬ್ಬ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗೆ 600 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದೆ. ಆಯಾ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಯ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಗನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಸ್ಪೆಷೆಂಡ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗೆ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 600 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಒದಗಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ವೇತನರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ 12 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಭಿರುಚಿಯುಳ್ಳ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಉದ್ಯೋಗರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸವು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಉತ್ತಮ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಟ್ಯುಷನ್ ವಸತಿವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಲ್ಲರುವವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಟ್ಯುಷನ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಅದು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಬರುವ ಹಾಗಿದ್ದು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಟ್ಯುಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಗೋಷ್ಠಿ ದರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಭಾರತ ಸೇವಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದೆ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಸೇವಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆದಳೆಂದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಖಂಡಿತ ವಾಗಿಯೂ ಭಾರತ ಸೇವಾದಳ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ಶಿಸ್ತು ಉಂಟುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ವಿನಃ ಅದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲ. ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಕ್ಯಾಡೆಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಸ್ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಸ್ತನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಭಾರತಸೇವಾದಳ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಅದು ರಾಜಕೀಯವಲ್ಲ.

ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯವಾಗುವ ಸಂಭವವಿರಬಹುದು, ಅದಾದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೂವೆ ಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆ ಈಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಆಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಯಂ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕಳೆದ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೂಡ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದೆ ನೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಕೇಂದ್ರಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಬರುವವಾಗೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡಾಗಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಮನೂವೆ ಅಂಗೀಕೃತವಾಗುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

**SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY (Malur).**— I wholeheartedly welcome the University Bill that has been introduced by our Education Minister. It marks a great landmark in the history of our University. It opens a new chapter as it were in our educational reforms in that it provides for a number of things which are an improvement over the University Act of 1953. Provision has been made for a Social Service Board, a Board of Appointments, the Controller of Examinations, Boards of Studies and a number of other things. The University administration, as many of my friends have been voicing for the last three days, has to be toned up and the standards have to be increased and this Bill, Sir, is in consonance with the development of modern trends. It is but right that our University education has to be reorganised with the advent of freedom. In the organisation set up provision has been made for a number of other things also.

Some friends suggested that States are on the eve of re-organisation, and as such why not the re-organisation of our University lie over for some time. We do not know when the States will be re-organised. Probably it may take a year or two. Even then what exactly will be the outcome of the Re-organisation Commission Report, we do not know and this matter of Re-organisation of University has been pending for a

very long time. I do not think it advisable to allow it to lie over for any length of time.

For the Joint Select Committee that is going to consider this Bill, I would like to make a few suggestions.

With regard to the Colleges that will be coming under the purview of this Bill, Clause 5 says :

“The following Colleges and sections of Colleges shall be University Colleges, namely :—

the Maharaja's College, Mysore ;  
the Central College, Bangalore ;

the pass course sections of —

the Yuvaraja's College, Mysore ;  
the Maharani's College for Women, Mysore ; the Maharani's College for Women, Bangalore ; the Medical College, Mysore ; the Engineering College, Bangalore ; Sri Ramnarayan Chellaram College of Commerce, Bangalore ; the Teachers' College, Mysore.”

According to this Bill, it is only these University institutions,—these colleges and pass course sections—that will come within the purview of the University Colleges and the other colleges for example, the First Grade College in Tumkur, the Medical School in Bangalore, and a number of other University institutions will not come within the purview of this Bill at all. According to section (2)—

“Save as provided in subsection (2) of section 64, all colleges and sections of colleges other than those specified in section (1) which immediately before the commencement of this Act were maintained by the University of Mysore, shall vest in the Government and shall be maintained as Government colleges.”

Therefore, a distinction has been for

the first time made between Government colleges and University colleges and according to this Bill, the University will be in control and supervision of only such institutions that have been mentioned in clause 5 and the other colleges will be Government colleges. What is the managing agency of the

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

Government colleges is not made clear here. Will it be the Director of Public Instruction or will a separate Board come into existence we do not know. Probably it may be the intention of the Government that these Government colleges will be managed by the Director of Public Instruction.

If that is so, I think, it will not be correct. No doubt provision is made in this Bill that the Government colleges may be transferred to the University at any time but which is the managing agency is not made known here. Therefore I submit, that this distinction between the University colleges and the Government colleges should go. Of course, it is clear from the Bill that the present colleges in the District Headquarters and other places will not come within the purview of this Bill. What exactly the Government are going to do with those colleges, we do not know so far. Nothing is said about it. Of course, our Educational Reforms Committee has suggested that the Intermediate colleges may be taken away from the purview of the administration of the University, that they may be tacked on to the Director of Public Instruction. But Dr. C. R. Reddy has made a suggestion that a separate Board may be created therefor. And in this Bill Sir, nowhere it is mentioned as to what exactly will happen to those various Intermediate colleges which are today run by the University. Therefore that has to be made clear. Of course section 54 says that the other educational institutions which are to-day run by the University will continue to be run under the auspices of the University till some arrangement is made by the Government as to Government colleges. No doubt, Government makes some arrangement later on, but there is already a feeling very seriously expressed by people that by taking away the Intermediate colleges from the purview of the University, the University atmosphere will be removed and that the standards will be lowered in the Intermediate colleges and it will be so with regard to other Government colleges which will be under the superintendence and management of

the Government and which will not be hereafter be under the management and control of the University. Therefore there was a suggestion made on the floor of this House sometime back that wherever there are Intermediate colleges in the District Headquarters at present, though they may be taken over by the Department of Public Instruction, first grade colleges may be created in those places and that they may be allowed to be run under the auspices of the University and the Government were pleased to give a reply that such a proposal is under the contemplation, and we do not know what exactly Government have decided upon that proposal. And I think it is very necessary that this distinction between the Government colleges and the University colleges should go and that first grade colleges should be created in all the district headquarters wherever there are Intermediate colleges and that those colleges should also be brought under the purview of the University. My submission is that University education should not be confined to the cities of Mysore and Bangalore only. The University atmosphere should pervade the whole of the State. There should be no centralisation of University education; University education should be taken even to the rural parts and not merely confined to urban areas. I hope the Select Committee that will examine this Bill will pay its attention to this matter and would clarify the position.

With regard to the few points mentioned by some of my friends about the autonomy of the University, no doubt it is not possible for the University to have financial autonomy unless the University is founded by private people with large donations. I hope such a time will come; but till then the University has to depend upon the Government for its annual grants. But when once the grants are made by the Government, I think, the University has to be allowed enough autonomy with regard to expenditure; whether the money has been properly spent or usefully spent Government should have the power to find out whether this has been properly spent or not. And for that, provision



is made for the visitorial and inspection functions of the Government. At any time they may cause a visit or inspection by any person or by any authority and find out whether the funds are properly used and the method in which the funds have been used and all that ; and they may issue some directions also in that behalf. But if one were to peruse the various provisions of this Bill carefully, it will be clear that the Chancellor who in this case happens to be the Rajpramukh of Mysore has been given very wide powers, powers of very big appointments and powers of consent, approval, so on and so forth in everything. Therefore a misgiving was expressed by many members of this Hon'ble House that while the Government have stated that they would have only visitorial and inspection powers but actually through the Chancellor of the University they will be exercising unfettered powers, absolute powers, and that this administrative autonomy of the University is a myth or a farce. It appears to me like that. Therefore, Sir, my suggestion is, if the University should have real administrative autonomy, I think, the Chancellor when once he is appointed by the Government—no doubt according to this Act it is the Rajpramukh of Mysore, but we do not know what exactly is going to be the future set up of our country, especially in view of the recommendations made by the States Re-organisation Commission, that the institutions of the Rajpramukhs in our country should be done away with,—my suggestion is that the Chancellor when once he is appointed, should be the constitutional head. Of course he is the constitutional head now so far as the administration of our State is concerned. But with regard to the running of the University, it is not clear from the provisions of this Bill whether the Chancellor as defined here will be a constitutional head in relation to his position with the Government under the Constitution of India as applicable to Mysore. No doubt he is the constitutional head, but such a constitutional head is given vast and absolute powers in this Bill. I do not know under what provision of law the

Chancellor's, powers when once he makes up his mind to exercise them under the provisions of this Bill, how are limited ; he is the absolute powerful head for the University. Therefore it is possible that the Chancellor may exercise powers in disregard of the Government and the University. No doubt it has been conventional that the Chancellor has been guided by the Government hitherto, but hereafter we do not know what the Chancellor will do. It is only on account of that point a number of apprehensions and misgivings are expressed by the Hon'ble Members that the Chancellor as contemplated under the provisions of this Bill will have vast powers and these powers will be exercised by the Government and not by the Chancellor. Therefore, as Hon'ble friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy was pointing out, the position has to be made clear in section 62 of the Bill that the Chancellor will merely carry out the decisions of the Syndicate or the University Council. The Syndicate will have eminent educationists on it ; few of them will be nominated by the Chancellor also and there will be men of learning and distinction. Therefore this body of 15 or 18 people should have absolute power and when once the decision is taken by the University Syndicate, that decision has to prevail and it should be left to the Chancellor only to carry out the decisions of the Syndicate and the Chancellor should not be made to wait for guidance and for instructions by the Government. If real autonomy has to be conferred on the University on the administration side, my suggestion is that it is the Syndicate that has to be made all powerful and not the Chancellor. The Chancellor should be merely a figurehead and he should carry out the decisions of the University Council.

**Sri P. R. RAMAIA.**—I would like to know how the Chancellor functions at present ; is he the mouthpiece of the Government or the mouthpiece of the Council ?

**Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.**—To answer that question, he should address the Minister or the Vice-Chancellor.

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

But anyway, as I have understood it, he is the mouthpiece of Government. I will leave it to the Minister to answer.

Sri F. R. RAMAIA.—He is raising a very important point. I would like to know the present position of the Chancellor. Is he the mouthpiece of the Government or the mouthpiece of the Council?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—He is the head of the University, Sir.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—As I have understood it—at present he is the mouthpiece of the Government. In actual practice the Rajpramukh or the Chancellor is guided by the Government. One other feature which I would like to refer to is this: I do not know why the framers of this Bill have lost sight of what is called the residential feature of the University.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know whether the Hon'ble Member requires more time?

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—I would require about 15 minutes more, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then the House will rise and meet at 3-30 P.M.

---

*The House adjourned at Three of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.*

---

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—I was referring to a very important point which I am afraid has been lost sight of by the framers of this Bill, namely, the residential feature of the University. Now that the University education has been sought to be reorganised, I think it is very necessary that our University should be made a residential University. The present number of colleges and institutions are sought to be reduced and are sought to be confined to Bangalore and Mysore Cities only and now the Intermediate colleges also will be removed according to this Bill from the purview and control of the University and to be tacked on to the Department of Public Instruction.

Therefore, it is very necessary that hostels wherever there are University colleges are built and the students lodged in those hostels and they be given proper coaching and guidance. Our very educational system is being remodelled and it is only recently our Government launched the movement of Vidyadan and Bhoodan under which land will be attached to the educational institutions and boys will be taught what is called basic education and other vocational education. In the Universities also we have for example the Viswabharati; we have the Aligarh University, the Osmania University and also some of the colleges in the Madras University—the Christian College and the Loyola College where hostels of a very huge magnitude are built to accommodate the students of those colleges and a closer contact is brought about between the teacher and the taught. The students are placed under the guidance of the Professors, the Lecturers and Readers and opportunities for knowing each at closer contact are afforded and there is scope for the building up of character, for the building up of personality and now that the University colleges are sought to be reduced here in our University it is very necessary that hostels should be built very near the colleges. No doubt there are already some hostels and where we do not have hostels or where the hostel accommodation is not sufficient, it is very necessary that we should construct or expand the hostel buildings and accommodate all the students of these colleges in those hostels. Of course, the Educational Reforms Committee have suggested that after the Intermediate colleges are taken away from the purview of the Universities and are tacked on to the Department of Public Instruction, the intention of the Reforms Committee is that the rush to the colleges should be reduced, that diversified courses should be opened and it is only those who have the aptitude or who have the fitness for University education that should be allowed to enter the University and a large number of others who fall short of the standards

that are set down for admission should be diverted to what are called other courses of polytechnics—the occupational institutes, technological institutes and so on and so forth. Therefore, my suggestion is that this rush to University institutions should be cut down. Finally, those who have the merit and those who can afford an University education, they should be allowed admission in the University Colleges and the rest of the boys should be diverted to what are called polytechnics of the kind we have in the West. That way I think we will be doing a good deal of service to our graduates.

The problem of unemployment is looming very large in the horizon already. I do not know how far the First Five-Year Plan has been in a position to solve the problem of unemployment and it is said that the Second Five-Year Plan is going to solve the problem to a very great extent and I do not know whether the solution of the unemployment problem under the Second Five-Year Plan is also as disappointing as it was under the First Five-Year Plan. But on the other hand, if the number of students that seek admission in the University colleges is reduced, is restricted and if they seek admission in the occupational institutes or polytechnical courses, the number of students that will be studying in the University institutions will be very limited and this residential principle of the University can be very easily put into practice. Some time back when I was a student in the Central College, when students were about to go astray, when discipline was at its lowest ebb, when the standards had gone down to a very great extent, the tutorial system was introduced whereby the students were brought under the immediate contact, control or supervision of the Lecturers and Professors and an opportunity had been afforded for closer contact between the teachers and the taught whereby the deficiencies of the students could be easily understood by the Professors and they could remove the deficiencies and defects and contribute to the building up of the character or personality of the

students. Therefore, I suggest to the Select Committee that is going to scrutinise and examine the provisions of this Bill to introduce the principle of the tutorial system or the residential feature of University education or at least make a beginning in that direction.

I now come to the next point which has raised so much of dust on the floor of this House, namely, whether the Vice-Chancellor should be elected or nominated. Some friends have pointed out that if an atmosphere of election were to prevail in the portals of the University it is likely that it will become the hotbed of politics and that the atmosphere of the University will be lost sight of, that there may not be the atmosphere of peace and calmness and impartiality and integrity so necessary for a University. Now we have elections for the various University authorities. A few members of the Senate are elected; some members of the Academic Council are elected and so also in the case of the Syndicate. I do not know why and how efficient people have not come up to these University authorities. In Madras also that principle is in vogue for so many years and we find eminent and learned educationists being selected or elected for the place of Vice-Chancellor. In our University also if the Senate or all the University authorities for that matter were to be allowed to make a selection or an election or choose a panel and send it up to the Chancellor I am sure an able and efficient Vice-Chancellor with integrity, honesty and character will be certainly elected and when once he is elected he will be there to carry out the decisions of the various University authorities, mainly the Syndicate. After all, these are democratic days. We are ourselves elected. We have an elected Ministry. To say that the Vice-Chancellor whose place is open to election or selection will create an atmosphere wherein politics will dominate and there will be no opportunity for an able and efficient Vice-Chancellor being selected, is, I think, an insult to the intelligence of this House, is an insult specially to

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

those who are elected. Time and again this question has come up on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the Assembly also.

Therefore, Sir, it will only be in the fitness of things if the privilege of electing a Vice-Chancellor for the University of Mysore were to be conferred upon our University. It is only an elected Vice-Chancellor who will administer the University ably and efficiently. It is he who will have enough initiative and enough enthusiasm. It is only he that can place the necessary policies and programmes before the University and carry them out quite efficiently and successfully.

With regard to the Social Service Board, a few friends suggested that this is an anomaly and that this does not fit in with the frame of the University Bill and, but for that, the Bill is quite well. I would only remind those friends of the fact that our own University had what is called the Social Service Settlement. Time and again, on the floor of the University it was being urged that some scheme of social service settlement be introduced and that University was not correct in doing away with the Social Service Settlement that we had and that it should be revived and all that. We need only refer to the Educational Reforms Committee Report wherein they have stated that the Social Service Settlement that the University had once founded should be revived. The reason for winding up the Social Service Settlement by the University was that it did not have sufficient funds. But now the Government have come forward to set apart substantial grants. In the Financial Memorandum they have said that Rs. 12 lakhs in the first instance will be provided for and that the financial implications of the functions of the Board are being worked out. I think this is the time for the revival of the various social service settlements and with regard to the details of these social service settlements, this Board is going to frame all the rules and regulations. Then we will be in a position to know what kind of social service has to be

rendered before the students are awarded degrees. I think Mysore University is the first University that is introducing the principle of social service on the part of the students before the award of degrees. We already find in the various University institutions students are enthusiastically coming forward and engaging themselves in some social service activity or other. Either during Dasara holidays or summer holidays, they have been running camps. They have been receiving training; they learn dignity of labour and self-respect and now after the advent of freedom in a poor country like ours, I think it is very necessary that, apart from the funds of the Government which after all are paid by the tax-payer in the country, the people and the students in particular have to render some service or other. We know how the modern graduates immediately after graduation come out of the portals of the University and are found misfits, absolutely unfit for any type of work. They only wait for some Government jobs and if they do not get the jobs, they only add themselves to the list of unemployed and are a menace to society. Now, if they receive some training for a period of six months or a year, they will certainly become useful citizens and even if they do not get any job, I am sure they will lead an independent life showing some affection or other in the public life of our country. Therefore, Sir, I congratulate the Government for the incorporation of this provision and thereby setting an example to other Universities in our country.

About grants, there was a good deal of controversy. I think it does not matter whether it is lapsable or not. It is the Government that has been giving these grants all these years and in fact, the Government were giving more grants than what is mentioned in the Bill. Under the Bill, the grant is only about Rs. 45 lakhs, being the average of the grants for three years. Therefore I do not know why this amount should be limited. I know as a Member of the Senate that the Government were

giving Rs. 55 lakhs, Rs. 60 lakhs or Rs. 70 lakhs and so on. Therefore, by imposing a restriction of this kind, I do not know why the University should have its hands tied. I do not think the University cannot spend money. In fact this is the time of plans and programmes. We had the First Five-Year Plan; we are having the Second Five-Year Plan. I am sure we will have any number of such Five-Year Plans, and money will be required for various purposes under the developmental schemes. This sum may not be sufficient at all. No doubt provision is made in the Bill that the Government may examine whether the grant that is made should be cut down or whether it should be raised depending upon the financial condition of the University. If the power is to be in the hands of the Government, it will take a long time for either increasing or reducing the grant. Therefore sufficient grants should be made available to the University. Even if this guarantee is not here, I am sure the Government will certainly give grants. It should not be restricted. The grants that the Government will have to give should depend upon the circumstances and depend upon the budget which the Syndicate or the University will prepare and send to Government. Therefore, I think what the Bill mentions, namely, about Rs. 45 lakhs or so, will hardly suffice to meet the requirements of the situation. It is better that this limit is removed and the Government take a decision on the Budget that is prepared by the University authorities. So far, it has not been our experience or the experience of the University that the Government will abnormally cut down grants. They will certainly rise to the occasion and make available sufficient grants. My submission is that under the Second Five Year Plan, there will be a number of plans which we will be launched and so, we will be in need of very heavy amounts and the Government will have to pay those amounts depending upon circumstances.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Clause 38 says:

“(1) (a) Subject to the provisions of clauses (b) and (c) the Govern-

ment shall, every year, make a non-lapsable lumpsum grant to the University consisting of—

(i) an amount equal to the average of the grants made to the University for a period of three years immediately preceding the commencement of this Act.”

This does not include expenditure to be incurred by the University for the Intermediate Colleges which are under their control.

**Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.**—No doubt if the educational institutions which are now under the control of the University are removed, that amount may be sufficient. But there may come a time when First-grade Colleges may be opened in each District in accordance with the assurance given by the Government and a number of other colleges may come within the purview of the University and we may reach a stage when this amount may not be sufficient.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—There is also provision made in sub-clause (b) by which the Government, after enquiry, will be in a position to enhance the grant according to the expenditure.

**Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.**—For that, the Government will have to hold an enquiry and that will take some time. Instead of that, it is better that this matter is kept open and a budget prepared by the University is sent up to the Government who will make the grant depending upon the circumstances and situation.

Then about the life of the various authorities, I would like to say a word. the life period of the Assembly Formerly, and the Council was only three years. Subsequently it was raised to four years and now it is five years. But with regard to University authorities, all along it has been only three years. It is, I think, very necessary that this period has also to be made equal and the period of the University authorities has to be co-terminus with the period of the Assembly and the Council and not merely three years. If we look to the odium of elections and the ordeals



(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

4 P.M.

of election, the period of three years is too short a period and within that short period they will not be in a position to do anything. Therefore, Sir, it is very necessary that this period has to be raised to five years. With these few remarks, I make these suggestions for the scrutiny of the Joint Select Committee that will be going into various details of the Bill.

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಅನಂತರಾಮ್.—(ಚಾಮರಾಜ ಪೇಟೆ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡದೆ ಹೊಸ ವಿಚಾರವಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ಅವರೂ ಸಹ ನಮ್ಮ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಕಣ್ಣು ಬಿಡುವ ಹಾಗಾಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಾಗಿದೆ, ಅಂತಹ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ಅವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದರ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ autonomy ಬಂದರೆ ಆಗ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ನೂಕುವಾದ ಒಂದು ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕಾದುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಇರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು Select Committeeಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. Social Service Board ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ಈ ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಅದನ್ನು ಐಚ್ಛಿಕ ಪಾಠವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಪಾಸುಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಸೇವೆಮಾಡಲಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏತಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವಂತೆ S.S.L.C.ಗೆ ಹಿಂದಿಯನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಐಚ್ಛಿಕ ಪಾಠವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದಿ ತರಗತಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬರೂ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಐಚ್ಛಿಕ ಪಾಠವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕಲಿತರೆ ಕಲಿಯಬಹುದು, ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಆ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಐಚ್ಛಿಕ ಪಾಠವನ್ನಾಗಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟು ಕಲಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಐಚ್ಛಿಕ ಪಾಠವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಸದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಕಲಿಯಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಒತ್ತಾಯವಿರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವಾಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರು ನೇಮಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೇಮಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಕ್ಯಾಡೆಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಸ್ ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋಜನ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಿಲಿಟರಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರೇ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಡೆಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮಿಲಿಟರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಮತ್ತು ಅನುಭವ ಪಡೆದಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಸಮಾಜಸೇವಾಸಮಿತಿ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರಬಾರದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ನಿರ್ಭರರೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದುವರ್ಷ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಕೊಡಿಸಿ ಯಾರನ್ನೂ ಫೀಲ್ ಮಾಡಿಸದೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಮುಗಿದಮೇಲೆ ಡಿಗ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಸೆಟ್ಸ್ ಮೆಂಟಿಂದು ಇತ್ತು. ಆಗ ಬೇಸಿಗೆ ರಜದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಡುಗರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತುಹದಿನೈದು ದಿನ ಬಿಡಾರಮಾಡಿ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗರೊಡನೆ ಸಹಕರಿಸಿ, ಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರೊಡನೆ ಉತ್ಸಾಹದಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಕಲಿಯಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಯದೆ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಪಡೆದು ಸಂಸಾರವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಲಿಯಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗೋಡೆಗಳ ನಡುವೆ ವಿದ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕಲಿತಾದಮೇಲೆ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಕಲಿಯುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಇರುವಂತೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಒತ್ತಾಯಬೇಕು. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರರಿರಬಹುದು. ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಸೇವೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಖರ್ಚಿನಿಂದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಉಚ್ಛ ಉಪಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕುಲಪತಿಗಳು, ಎಂದರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಓದಿನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗುವುದೇ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್‌ಅವರೇ ಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಿನ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಯುಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಕುಲಪತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾದವರಲ್ಲಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟವರು ಎಂದು ಸದಸ್ಯ

ರಿಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಮದರಾಸು ನಲ್ಲರುವಂತೆ ತಜ್ಞರಾಗಿರುವ ಎರಡುಮೂರು ಜನರ ಹೆಸರಿನ ಪೇನಲ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಚಾನ್ಸಲರ್‌ರವರೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ 'hot bed of communal politics' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದರ ಅನುಭವ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನೇರ್ಪಡಿಸುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅವರು ಈ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಡ್ವಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇನ್ನೆಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಐದಾರು ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಿರಬೇಕು ತಾನಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಕಾಲೇಜು ಮುಂತಾದ ಕಾಲೇಜು ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗಬಾರದು. ಹೊರಗಿನವರನ್ನು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು; ತಾವೇ ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾತ್ರರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರೇ ತಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿರುವವರನ್ನು ತಜ್ಞರಾಗಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆಮಾಡಲಿ. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನೇ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಆ ಗೌರವ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತಜ್ಞರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ನಾಮಿನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಪಮಾನಕರ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಜನ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಟ್ಟು ಹೆಸರು ತಪ್ಪಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಹೊರದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನರಿತು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಅಥವಾ ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲೆಕ್ಚರರುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿಯೂ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿಯೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜನ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಾಣುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಅಕ್ಯಾಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಾಲ್‌ಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಶಾಖೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿನ ತಜ್ಞರು ಇಂಥವರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ. ಆದರೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಎಂಬುದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವ ಸಮಿತಿ; ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನ ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿರಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಈ ನ್ಯೂನತೆ ತಪ್ಪಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಚುನಾಯಿತ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ.

ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಿಂಗಾರಡ್ಡಿ ಯವರು 45 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವವರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು, ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ಒಂದೊಂದುಸಾರಿ ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾಧ್ಯಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಮದರಾಸು ಮುಂತಾದ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರೇ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೊಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿರುವುದು. ಇತರ ಕಡೆ ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ affiliate ಆಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳು ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಮಗೇ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಯೂ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಿಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಹಳ್ಳಿಗೂ ಸ್ಕೂಲನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೊಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಲ್ಲ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾಧ್ಯಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆಯುವುದು? ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಳಗಿನ ಮುಟ್ಟದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಹೆಚ್ಚಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಲ್ಲದೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಕಳಗಿನ ಮುಟ್ಟದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳೇ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಹುದು. ಆಗ ಉತ್ತಮ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳೇ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ನಿಲ್ಲುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇತರ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳನ್ನಾರಂಭಿಸಬಾರದು, ಆದಷ್ಟು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ 45 ಲಕ್ಷ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸಾಲದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡುವ ಬದಲು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುವವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವಂತರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು. ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಂದ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ವೇತನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಟಿಚ್ಚುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರ ಮಕ್ಕಳೇ ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಅವರು ಫೀಜನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಲ್ಲರು. ಬಡವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವೇತನಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರೀಷಿಪ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಹುಕಾರರ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಫೀಜನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾಡಲಿ. ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಮಾಡಲಿ. ನಾನು ಇನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮನೋದ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ, ಅದರ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಅನಂತರಾಮನ್.)

ಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್‌ನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ; ಅದರಿಂದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. 1915ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನೇನು ಸುವರ್ಣ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾಲಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಆಶಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

**Sri B. T. KEMPARAJ** (Bangalore North—Scheduled Castes).—The Bill is a very important one giving an independent status to the University. Of course, it has already been said that it was a long-drawn subject which has attracted the attention of all the educated people of the country. In this Bill, Sir, only a few selected colleges have been included in the proposed University. But there are more number of offices created to run the University. When we consider the structure of the body of the University, when there are so many new vacancies coming up to be filled, I do not know why so many colleges have been left out without including them into the University. Only seven colleges have been included while other colleges have not been included in the University—the other first-grade colleges of other districts.

There is a new vacancy created, *viz.*, the Additional Registrar. So when the work of the University is found to be increasing, the Vice-Chancellor or the Chancellor as the case may be, can appoint additional Registrar. Therefore it clearly makes us to understand that the offices are increasing while the colleges affiliated to the University are decreasing in consideration of the existing colleges. Another officer the Bursar has also come into the picture. The Controller of Examinations is a new office contemplated in this Bill which will also come into force. Therefore, it is in the interests of the country that it is better that all the first-grade colleges, whether they are run by the independent agencies or by the Government, will go into the fold of the University before this Act will come into force. There is a provision made that “the Government may, at any

time and after consulting the Syndicate, by order transfer any Government college to the University and from the date of such transfer the said college shall be University college.”

To have such a clause and also to exclude some of the institutions which are under the control or under the direct supervision of the University, now to remain outside the purview of the university will not be a good feature when the University as such is coming into force. Again, Sir, section 18 clause (3) Meetings of the Senate, which runs as follows:

“(3) Subject to the conditions prescribed, special meetings shall also be convened by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss matters of urgent importance upon a requisition in writing signed by not less than one-third of the members of the Senate, provided that the Vice-Chancellor, may decline to call for such meetings, if, in his opinion, the subject matter to be discussed at the special meetings is either inadmissible or is beyond the competence of the Senate to discuss.”

Under such circumstances the members of the Senate will naturally know the subject they have to discuss before them when one-third of the members of the Senate bring a subject for discussion before the Senate then the Vice-Chancellor is given a discretion whether to convene the Senate meetings or not. Therefore such a discretionary power to vest with the Vice-Chancellor will not be correct and the members of the Senate may not be in a position to exercise their right properly.

Coming next to the point of appointment of the Vice-Chancellor, Sir, it is said by some of our friends that the Vice-Chancellor may be elected. Of course, these are the days of democracy where every one likes to enjoy the privilege of election; but a person who has been in contact with the colleges, who is in the service for a long period, will be a better person to be the Vice-Chancellor in the place of an elected Vice-Chancellor. Vice-Chancellor is a person who has to see to the administrative affairs of a big institution, *viz.*,

the University. If such an office is not controlled, managed, supervised and looked after by a well experienced administrative head, and if an elected Vice-Chancellor is placed in that office. It will not be a proper administration.

So far as this Board of Appointments is concerned, I think, some of our friends have made some special references. Appointments to the teaching staff of the University shall be made in accordance with the rules made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Senate and the Mysore Public Service Commission and for purpose of making such appointments, there shall be a Board of Appointments consisting of the following members *viz.*, Vice-Chancellor and others. Whenever such appointments to the University are made, the applicants, though they might be well qualified, though they might be meritorious, though they might be experienced, in so many instances their cases have not been considered favourably. I think personally, Sir, it is better that the Vice-Chancellor and some of the Professors of the concerned departments will constitute a Committee with the Public Service Commission when such appointments have to be filled up in the University. Because it is our personal experience on several occasions, that some appointments will be made on so many conditions. Some appointments will be filled up without the knowledge of the members on so many occasions. Whenever several appointments are filled up in other departments, the Public Service Commission will be asked to sit along with the Heads of Departments where such appointments are made. I think, there will not be much difficulty, if the Vice-Chancellor and other members, and the professors concerned were to sit, while making selections, with the members of the Public Service Commission and make these appointments. Thereby we could find some justice to the applicants.

Coming to the point of nomination of members to the several bodies of the University, I would like to say that whenever nominations are made, they should be made by the Chancellor. The present practice of nomination is very peculiar, peculiar in the sense that

some of the members who might have not seen or might not have stepped into the colleges have been made to sit as members in these bodies. Such persons will not be capable of filling up those chairs; they may not be able to understand or they may not be able to see how the colleges or the several academic institutions will be functioning. Therefore, whenever nominations are made to these bodies, adequate qualification should be taken into consideration. At least a graduate should be nominated as a member of these bodies. Why I am saying is, the member who is nominated to these bodies if he has got some knowledge of the colleges or these institutions, he will represent the cause of the persons interested in these bodies in a befitting manner and also it will be helpful to the person or the officer or whoever it may be interested in these institutions.

Regarding the Social Service Board, I might say that it is a new feature in the University. It has been stated by our friends that it will make the graduates to come in contact with several social services. But one point that we have to consider is, during the course of social service every student is expected to render, free Service. How about his existence? how can he be able to serve one year freely after his education career is over? This is a very important question which we have to consider. My suggestion is that the Government or the University should think of starting such a Board wherein students will be given free scope to serve with no difficulty for their existence or livelihood. With these suggestions, Sir, I think the Bill is a welcome one and I support this Bill. Thank you, Sir.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. 5ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಮೀಡಿಯೇಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ಗತಿಯನ್ನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡನೆಯ ಒಳನಿಬಂಧನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೊಂದು ಹಂಗಾವಿ: ಏರ್ಪಾಡೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬಹುದಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫ್ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಷನ್‌ನವರ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ)

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಹಿಸುವವರ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಶಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಇಬ್ಬಾಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಇದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಮುಂದೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ, ಇಂಟರ್‌ಮೀಡಿಯೇಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತವೆಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಹಾಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿವೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾಸುಧಾರಣಾ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ, ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಘ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂತು. ಮೈಸೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಮತದಿಂದ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಮೀಡಿಯೇಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವೂ ಆಯಿತು. ಅದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಅದು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಪರಿಣಿತರ ಒಡಗೂಡುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಭಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂತೂ, ಈಗಲೂ ಕಾಲ ಮಿಂಚಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಮೀಡಿಯೇಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

4-30 P.M.

ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಾತಾವರಣವೇನಾದರೂ ಅದು ಉಳಿಯಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಕೇವಲ ನನ್ನೊಬ್ಬನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಅನೇಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಈ ಒಂದು ಮನೋವೇದ ಕೇವಲ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯವರ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಅಫಿಲಿಯೇಟೆಡ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದು ಅನುಕೂಲಪಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ರಚಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಗಿಂತ ಅಫಿಲಿಯೇಟೆಡ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸೇವಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷಿಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಈ ಮನೋವೇದವನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳೂ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳೂ, ಸೇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೋಡಿಸಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಾನು ರಾಜ್ಯಪರ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ತಪ್ಪು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇವಲ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಇತರ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ರೀತಿ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದನಂತರ ನಾನು ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಫಿಲ

ಯೇಟೆಡ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ಗ್ಯಾಂಪಿಗೂ ಸೇರದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಯುರ್ವೇದಿಕ ಕಾಲೇಜು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಇದು ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖಾ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸಲು ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯನ್ ಮೆಡಿಸಿನ್ ಇದೆ. ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ವಿಷಯ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮೂಲಕವೂ ಮತ್ತು ವರ್ತಮಾನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೂಲಕವೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗಮನಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ದರ್ಜೆಗೆ ಏರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೇಳುವುದೇ ಒಂದು, ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಒಂದು. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪದವೀಶೀ ಔಷಧಿಯ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ದಿನದಿನಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ದೇಶೀಯ ಔಷಧಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸ್ಥಾನ ದೊರೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಕಾಲೇಜನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೊಳಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆಗಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಲಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಈಗ ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ. ಪದವೀಧರರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ವಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡು ರಚಿತವಾದನಂತರ ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವಾ ಸರ್ವಿಫಿಕೇಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮಾಜಸೇವಾ ಸಮಿತಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಸರ್ವಿಫಿಕೇಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು. ಸಮಾಜಸೇವಾ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟಿನ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ರಚಿತವಾದ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ಆದಾಯ ಮತ್ತು ವೆಚ್ಚಗಳ ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್‌ಗಳಿಂದ ಮಂಜೂರಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವಾ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸೇರವಾಗಿ ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಮಾಜಸೇವಾ ಸರ್ವಿಫಿಕೇಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಪಡೆದಮೇಲೆ ಹೊಂದುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಪಡೆಯುವ ಮುನ್ನವೇ ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದು ಬಹಿಷ್ಕಾರ ತೀರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಸರ್ವಿಫಿಕೇಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು; ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಇರಬಾರದು; ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಇರುವುದು ಅಪಾಯ. ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೊಳಪಡಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿ. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದೇ ಸರಿ.

ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಗ್ರೇಡ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನೇಕ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿವೆ. ಈ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವೇ ಕೆಲವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಬಾಕಿಯವುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಡಲು ಕಾರಣವೇನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.



ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎ. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ (ಕುಣಿಗಲ್).— ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಮನೋದಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲಪಾಧಂಧ ಬಿಲ್ಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನಾದರೂ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಇದು ತೀರಾ ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು ಮತ್ತು ಜರೂರಾದಂಥಾದ್ದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನಗೆ ತೋರಿಬಂದಂಥ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅವಗಾಹನೆಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಕೋಣವನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ತಾವು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ರಚಿಸುವಾಗ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಲ್ಡ್ ಆಫ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ದೇಶದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮೂಲೆಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾಗಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಂದಲೂ ವಸೂಲಿಮಾಡಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಂಥ ಹಣ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನ ದುಡಿಮೆಯಿಂದ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಹಣ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವಿವರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದರ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಏರಿಸುವಾಗ ಮತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ರೂಪಿಸುವಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅರಿಯಬೇಕು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ದೊರಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ, ಬಾಕಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೆ ದೊರಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ನೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ; ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ Joint Select Committeeಗೆ ಹೋದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ Joint Select Committee ಯವರು ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಕೋಣವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Social service ಮೇಲೆ ಅನೇಕರು ಅನೇಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ

ರಚನೆಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಿತದಲ್ಲರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಡಿಗ್ರಿಯನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ social ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಸೂಚನೆ ಈ clauseನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಇದ್ದರೋ ಅದರಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬದುಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಸಾಧನೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಾದಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅವನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ social work ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಈ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕೊನೆಯ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ಅವನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೇರ್ಗಡೆಯಾಗುವ ಮೊದಲು ಇಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ವರ್ಕ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿತದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಯು ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನು 30 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಅಥವಾ 60 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾದ social work ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅವನು ಹೀಗೆ social workನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಈ social workಗೆ ಬರೆತಕ್ಕ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Degree Course ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷವೇ ಇರಲಿ, ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷವೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಅಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಬರುವ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಡಿಗ್ರಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊನೆಯ ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ social work ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅವನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಯು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೋ, ಅಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲವೂ ಅವನು social workನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ನಂಬರ್ ಎಂದು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅವನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೇರ್ಗಡೆ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಡುವ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಎಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ವ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳೂ social service ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ workನ ವಿವರಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ನಾವು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭವೂ ಒದಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಅವನು social work ನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕು, ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಡಿಗ್ರಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ Select Committeeಯವರು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎ. ನೂರಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ)

Vice-Chancellorನ್ನು nominate ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ elect ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ನನ್ನ ನೋಟನೆ ಆದರೂಕೂಡ ಹೀಗಿದೆ. ಅನೇಕರು democratic ತತ್ವದಮೇಲೆ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ election ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನಾದರೂಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಗೊಂದಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಘನತೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಘನತೆ, ಗೌರವ ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಘನತಾವಂತ ಯೋಗ್ಯ integrity ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ಒಂದು ದೇಶ ದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂಥವನನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ election ಮಾಡಿದರೆ no confidence ಎಂದು ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬಹುದು. Election ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ Syndicate ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರಬಹುದು. ಇಂತಹ ಗೊಂದಲಕ್ಕೆ Vice-Chancellor ಮುಟ್ಟುವುದನ್ನು ಇಳಿಸಬಾರದು. ಒಂದು ಗೌರವ ಮುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಇರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಚಾನ್ಸಲರು appoint ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳ ಮುಟ್ಟಿದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ purity ಇರಬೇಕು. ಶಿಶ್ಯವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ purity ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ, ಸೃಷ್ಟಿತೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇಹೋದರೆ ದೇಶ ಬಹಳ ಜಾಗೃತೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಹೋಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ Boardನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಟನೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಏನೇ ಮಾಡಲಿ ಅದು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರಬೇಕು. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ಬಹಳ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ವಂತನಾದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾನೋ ಆತನು ನಿರಾಶೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಯಾರಿಗೆ merit ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂತಹ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ merit ನಲ್ಲ ಬರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಅದು ಹಾಗಾಗ ಬಾರದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ನ್ಯಾಯ, ಧರ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರಕದೆ ಒಂದು ಆಂದೋಲನಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಆಗದಹಾಗೆ ಇಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಬದಗಿದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ವಾದ ದಂಡನೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು clauseನ್ನು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ಉತ್ತಮ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಯಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಪ್ರವೇಶದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನಾ ಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಏರು ಪೇರುಗಳಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಏರು ಪೇರುಗಳಿಗೆ merit ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು. Merit ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಹುಡುಕುತ್ತಿ

ದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದ ನ್ನೇಲೂ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದರೆ admissions ವಿಚಾರ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಕಟ್ಟುನಿಟ್ಟಾಗಿರುವುದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಾಗಲಿ ಸಮಿತಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಏರು ಪೇರುಗಳಿರುವವರೆಗೂ merit ಮೇಲೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪೂರ್ವಕ ವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಸರಾಸರಿ ಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದೆ, ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು, ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು. ಬಡ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ವೇತನಗಳು ಇತರ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ಈಗಿರುವುದು ಸಾಲದು. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡಿದ ಹೊರತು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ದೊರೆಯುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ, ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿರುವ Socialistic pattern of societyಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೋಟಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

\*Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, we have heard the Hon'ble Members for three days with rapt attention. Many of them, almost all of them, have taken very deep interest in the matter, in the organisation of our higher education, devoted time for the study, welcoming sound features that are found there and criticising such of the portions they have found to be defective. That such a large number of the Hon'ble Members should take such a deep interest in respect of higher education is a matter for congratulation.

Now, Sir, the criticism can be analysed into three aspects—those which deal directly with the University Bill, those that deal in general with education and those that are outside these two categories. On this occasion, I shall not devote any time to that part of the criticism made beyond either the University Bill or the educational sphere, nor need I mention anything about the general aspects of education which have been adverted to by both. I shall confine myself solely to the Bill before us.

On this Bill, one very cogent question was put by an Hon'ble Member whether we referred this to the University Council or the Senate or to any other body. I welcome the question. I may at once state that we have not directly referred this Bill for criticism to the Council or the Senate. But we are fully posted with their points of view, because our Bill is mostly based on Dr. C. R. Reddy's Report or our Educational Reforms Committee Report, both of which went before the University Council and the Senate and we have had their reaction, and since this is based on them, having had full information before, we might say with confidence that we have had their view points. Next Sir, throughout the time of the drafting of the Bill, the Vice-Chancellor of the University was associated with us at every stage and in every form and he was in every way connected with all University bodies. Therefore, I say that the best thing possible has been done. If it had been referred to the Senate, a little more time would have been spent and in order to save that and to avoid a thing which we felt unnecessary, we have come before this house basing this Bill mainly on Dr. C. R. Reddy's Report and our Educational Reforms Committee's proposals.

Further, while on this subject, I might also take the House into confidence and say that we have very carefully scrutinised the proposals of the Indian University Commission as well as the recent enactments regarding the Universities, for instance, Sri Venkateswara University Act. Also I might say, before as well as after the drafting of the Bill, I have discussed the matter with several Vice-Chancellors and had their reactions also and the benefit of many others. I might confidently say that the best possible way of consulting with the best in the land has been done and I wish to submit with confidence that the mature experience of so many people right from the top—Dr. Radhakrishna, down to the various Vice-Chancellors of this University and others, are before us in the shape of this Bill, and, in the Select Committee also, I will take them further into our

confidence and point out the particular reactions of the various Vice-Chancellors in respect of certain sections also as far as possible.

The next point of criticism is whether this was the proper time to introduce a Bill of this nature especially when the States Reorganisation proposal is before us when the face of the country is to be changed. Well, Sir, whether Mysore extends or contracts, I am sure the University will exist. For an expanded Mysore or a contracted Mysore, I am sure all of you are anxious to give the best educational agency and therefore to reorganise the University, we need not wait for the disposal of this issue. Moreover, the reorganisation of States may take one year or two years or three years. We do not know how the future will shape itself. Therefore I feel that this is the proper time to introduce and set our house in order in regard to the reorganisation of higher education. Further, even history points that we must take up this question. Our University was started in the year 1916. The first amendments came in 1933 and 1936, twenty years later. And 20 years have elapsed. We are very near 1956, and therefore another twentieth year is before us. That is one aspect, the historical process. The next process I see is—in fact my personal reaction—that the first period was occupied by the officials of the bureaucracy that governed our country.

5 P. M.

In the second period that is from 1933 or 1936 we had introduced a large political element, the result of which many Hon'ble Members know. Now having had those experiences of bureaucratic University and a political University, now we are trying to change a little and making it an Academic University, introducing a large percentage of academicians who are well versed and we are trying to entrust this to their care. I wish to submit that this is only my personal reaction as I see through the historic process which is before us. Let me hope that this handing over to the academicians will prove useful, beneficial and also successful.

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)

Now let me take a few of the organs of the University about which there has been adequate or ample criticism. Regarding the Chancellor, the main criticism has been that he is vested with very large powers. I do not know if we could entrust this to any other person or institution in our country. The Indian experience is, in all the Universities, it is the head of the State—either the Rajpramukh or a Governor, is made the head of the University, except in Venkateswara University where the Chief Justice of Andhra has been made the Chancellor. And I learn that an amendment is already there to entrust it back to the Government. Why so? It is not fortuitous accident that the Heads of States are made Chancellors. Being the Heads of States, it is their responsibility to see that the higher education is properly based, moulded and guided. We cannot entrust it to any other person. We have, therefore, rightly chosen to follow the tradition which is there from a long time, of making the Rajpramukh as the Chancellor. There may be some difficulty, but we cannot help it, human nature being what it is.

Next Sir, in any institution, particularly in a statutory institution, investing of powers with the Head of the State is not a detraction to that institution itself. There is the Thirupathi University, the head of it is the Governor. If we entrust him with full powers, it is not a detraction of that institution. We have to give powers to them and we cannot give it to any other person. So it is inevitable that we look to the Head of the institution. We know what the human nature is and we know how to adjust and we have also studied as to who will properly regulate the powers and we have got precedence in that behalf. Therefore entrusting the Chancellor with powers is not an inevitability but is a proper thing which we have done.

Regarding the Vice-Chancellor, the main contention has been whether it should be by nomination process or elective process, as may be called, or by selection process. The elective process, I may be pardoned if I were to say,

has been condemned outright. We have got the past experiences. Such a practice is not available in any western countries and in the Indian Universities. They are finding it rather very hard and their experience is rather bitter. *Via media* has been tried regarding that. I wish to submit Sir, that we have discussed this aspect at great length. When we think of investing the Chancellor with the powers for making appointments, there is ample scope in selecting including the Syndicate members. The Vice-Chancellor being the head of the Institution and having the good of the institution at heart, I am sure, he will consult all persons interested for the purpose of making appointments. Now the choice of Vice-Chancellor is not limited to Mysore State alone; we have got All-India scope for making a selection. If we confine it to election, may be, I am sure no non-Mysorean, will come for the election. We will be denying ourselves of the opportunity of getting best talents available in the country into that appointment. For the cause of education, the late His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore had nominated the greatest savants of the time born in India to this institution. I am sure the person selected would never have had aspired for any election. He had certain love for the betterment of the institution. It is better to trace the world experience and view this problem dispassionately. I might say that it is better to give powers to the Chancellor to appoint eminent persons giving him the greatest amount of latitude and the widest scope for selection so that the best man might be made available.

Now, Sir, regarding the Senate, the present Senate consists of about 76 members. By the new arrangement, it will consist of 60 members. Therefore proportionately we have reduced the elective element because of the reduction in the number. And Dr. C. R. Reddy himself says that it must be a compact body capable of proper deliberations and speedy action, etc. Therefore a similar body has been made, reducing in proportion the elective element and at the same time we have strengthened by increasing the number of academic element so that, as I said,

eventually, ultimately, it might be an Academic Body. They would all shed light and put us properly in our way. There is not much criticism on that point and I will leave it at that.

Regarding the Syndicate, which is the new name for the University Council,—I believe Dr. Reddy says that it is better to revert back to that name—the Syndicate will not contain any political element. It is the highest executive authority as it were and in our scheme of things, while the political element that was there has been put in the Senate, it has not been put in the executive body. I feel that this arrangement will bring in the purity for which there has been so much of demand.

Next regarding the members that are there, there are two views,—that there should be representation for the University staff and that there should not be. That is a point which I am sure the Select Committee will have to go into with the University elements and re-form it in the manner that is necessary. I do not want to dilate on it further.

Regarding powers, we have got a Board of Appointments which has been recommended by the Indian University Commission and probably in Dr. Reddy's Report. Barring that power, the Syndicate has all the powers. Therefore, we have not deprived the Syndicate of any of its powers while making it more academic.

The next body is the Academic Council. Here the present strength is 120 and we have tried to reduce it to 50. That is the recommendation of Dr. Reddy. Because the other body is so big, so unwieldy and it had the consequences arising therefrom, as per his recommendation we have brought it down to 50 and made it a compact body while giving it all the representation that the Faculties would deem necessary and there has not been much criticism on that. Therefore, I do not want to dilate on that.

These are the important organs that are to-day and they have been re-formed, to which we have added two or three departments. I will refer to it in a few minutes. There was

much talk, much thinking—I do not think by using the word 'talk' I am using it lightly—there has been a good deal of loud thinking about the autonomies that are necessary to be there. I may straightaway say that full academic autonomy, full administrative autonomy has been given. I would refer to the financial autonomy. They get their finances mainly from this body, this Legislature and while giving money I am sure this House has a responsibility to the electorate and to the country to see that it is properly spent. For a member to argue on the one side in support of full autonomy and on the other side to justify his position as legislator, probably is rather very delicate. Therefore, in the interests of reconciling both the aspects of the question, as much power as possible and necessary has been given and only such power as is necessary for controlling has been retained, and we have appointed a Finance Commission which goes into the matter and not by any devious methods but by straight methods alone we have dealt with it. The finances have to be audited and there is a Committee for that, while there is the Legislature guaranteeing necessary sums for this expenditure. We have said non-lapsable grant. So once we give it we have no right to take it back, whether they spend it or not, but if they spend less, where spending less is a permanent feature, I am sure you will not agree to giving donations for which there is no need. No man will say 'Give them money because you have given it last year.' For instance, for running a particular Faculty. On the contrary we have made it elastic and said that if they expand in a proper direction and if Government approves of the direction we are going to increase the grant. I do not see there is any harm or snag in the whole thing and even the Grants Commission, I am sure, cannot find fault with it. Whether the Grants Commission was right in denying grant on the basis of want of autonomy in Universities is another question. Apart from the question, we are ourselves, as I said, moving with the times and having had other experiences we want



(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)  
to give more and more powers to the academicians. We have done the right thing and the proper thing at this stage.

Apart from the Board of Appointments, for which there has been a demand, for which there are necessary proposals, there are the recommendations of the other two bodies which we have accepted and put in there. And in recruitment also on the public policy of consulting the Public Service Commission as well as on the academic side, the Syndicate, necessary rules will be framed and the Board of Appointments will have to implement those recommendations. I believe it is a nice balancing of all the factors inherent in the situation and giving it a proper direction.

Lastly, regarding the Social Service Board which is, as many members put it, the unique feature of the University constitution, true it is the first University to launch on this experiment for which there has been a demand throughout India for a decade or two and therefore you find several novel features. For instance, the composition of that Board, the creation of that Board has been left to the Rajpramukh and not to the Chancellor. Finally, what shape it will take I leave it to the Select Committee to formulate. Anyway, in the initial stages wherever we have got to give shape to it properly a person who has got the authority of collecting various elements in order to make that Board a success must be invested with those powers. For instance we cannot entrust it to the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate. In order that the Board might function, as one member very rightly put it, we must give work in an agriculture farm, we must give work in a hostel, we must give work in a dam building and so on. If to-day, without bringing all of them together and making necessary rules and regulations, we give it to the University, I am sure it will not work. Therefore, in order to mould it, in order to give it all opportunities of growth we have reserved it to the Rajpramukh so that we might give them all the help that would be

necessary. As I submitted, this is an initial stage, the first step that we are taking and in no circumstances, it should fail. That is the reason. If it is left to the University and now. . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಯುನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ನಾವೇ ಮಾಡಲು ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಕ್ಷಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ಮತ್ತೆ ಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸೋಣವಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಿಂದ ಸರ್ವಿಫಿಕೇಟ್ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಲ್ಲದೆ ಸೇವೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅನೇಕರು ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಪಾಡಿಗಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ತಾವು ಈಗ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಫ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್‌ಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಈ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ಸಬ್‌ಜೆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಸಿಲಬಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರ್, ಬಲಿಂಗ್, ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್, ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಡಿಗ್ರಿಗಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಆದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೇನು ತೊಂದರೆಯಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, as the name indicates, it is a Social Service Board. It is not an agency to give technical education. For that there are other institutions. For higher technical studies we have technical colleges; for lower course of study in those technics we have got the Schools. This is not at all meant for that. This is meant to bring together the rural and urban folk, the educated and the uneducated and then to create a homogenous society. That is the main objective. Therefore, in order, as I said, to bring about a homogenous society which can only be done by service this is intended. That is the purview of that. The other aspects which many members have put forward may be considered by the Select Committee. I do not want to come in the way. Let there be a thorough discussion. One other question was put. There is some wrong impression about it. Let me put it clearly. This social service course will not come after the degree is conferred. It will come before the degree is conferred; in order to entitle oneself to get the degree a student must pass through that course. That is what the regulation says. It is of one year's duration.

No doubt two words are put. One is 'compulsory' and the other is 'free.' It is compulsory in the sense that we have compulsory subjects such as English, Kannada, etc. It is free in the sense that the student is not paid anything. On the contrary, for his subsistence we have provided in the Financial Memorandum. We have estimated that there would not be more than 20,000 students in different grades of colleges who will complete their courses of studies before taking their degree; about Rs. 40 or Rs. 50 will be enough for their subsistence; it need not be even that; calculating on that, it will be on an average about Rs. 12 lakhs. There is one other factor. That is what I am going to say before the Select Committee also. I discussed some aspects of the University Bill with Dr. Radhakrishnan, particularly with reference to this clause.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎ. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಬೇರೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು consider ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಈಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು unique feature ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು. I was referring to discussions with Dr. Radhakrishnan. He said after some discussion: "Well, here is an idea which is being seriously discussed among the educational authorities and also with the Defence Department of making N.C.C. compulsory for all students of the University and in this context we might discuss that also because there cannot be duplication. Further, if the N.C.C. course is made obligatory, it can also be entrusted with social service work." This happened over 4 or 5 months ago. Then I went to the Defence Ministry. They said: "We are seriously thinking about it and we will give you our reactions in a couple of months." Recently when I was there, I again discussed with them. They told me that the matter was not decided and we might expect early reactions in the matter. That also we might take into consideration when we decide this matter. We may keep all these things in our mind in the Select Committee and see whether by making

it compulsory it would not clash with N.C.C. and then we may do the needful.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—May I know whether this Board is independent of the University?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is quite independent according to Rules.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is introduced in the University Bill. But in the constitution of the Board, nothing prevents the Rajpramukh from making the Vice-Chancellor as Chairman of the Board. That will give the necessary link. As I said, this is a new venture and we have introduced it with great circumspection and caution so that it might succeed.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—How is the nexus brought about between the University authority and the Board?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—

While constituting the Board, we will take care to see that necessary nexus is brought about. When the University Vice-Chancellor is there, he will bring the reaction to the Syndicate and the Syndicate will finally discuss. Thus we will get the necessary nexus between the two. We might further discuss it in the Select Committee. I think these are the few important aspects of the Social Service Board.

Finally, as I have already indicated in my opening remarks our University at present is charged with research work. Formerly there used to be some research particularly in the Central College as well as in the Maharaja's College which produced good results and which brought reputation for our Colleges. Today, we are feeling a void as it were. We have got to lever it up and bring it up to proper standards. That is one of the objects. The second is, as I have already said, to fit it into the new pattern of socialistic society and to produce a homogeneous society, and lastly to bring discipline of the mind, body and the heart into the University. Let me hope, Sir, with these objectives, the University Bill will forge proper links and give us a proper frame-work to work out and bring out these results. The Select Committee, I am sure, will give full

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)  
consideration to all the aspects that the Hon'ble Members have indicated, keeping before them the points of view which I have put forward to which I shall try to add when there is a clause by clause discussion in the Select Committee.

SRI K. PRABHAKAR (Nela-mangala).—With regard to the Social Service Board, if it is affiliated at the college level, it is clear that only a few students who come out of the colleges will be given opportunity in the social service. It is evident thereby that the S.S.L.C. students and the Intermediate College students who will go about their studies will not be given this opportunity; we will be giving training to topmost people only. Whenever we think of Universities, we remember two great ideals of decentralisation of colleges and the faculties thereby.

MR. SPEAKER.—You are making a speech. Nobody is allowed to make a speech.

SRI K. PRABHAKAR.—I wanted to ask some questions.

MR. SPEAKER.—You did not ask. The question is :

“That the Mysore University Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration.”

*The motion was adopted.*

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—  
Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore University Bill, 1955, be referred to a Joint Select Committee of this House and the Legislative Council, consisting of a total number of fifteen members (ten from this House and five from the Legislative Council), that the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained therefor and that the following members of this House shall be members of the Joint Select Committee, namely,

Sriyuths—

1. K. Hanumanthaiya
2. K. Pattabhiraman

3. Mali Mariyappa
4. J. Mohamed Imam
5. B. N. Boranna Gowda
6. A. Bheemappa Naik
7. B. Narayanaswamy
8. Sirasappa Ijari
9. G. Duggappa
10. M. Rajasekhara Murthy

with a direction that the report be presented during this session.”

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore University Bill, 1955, be referred to a Joint Select Committee of this House and the Legislative Council, consisting of a total number of fifteen members (ten from this House and five from the Legislative Council), that the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained therefor and that the following members of this House shall be members of the Joint Select Committee, namely,

Sriyuths—

1. K. Hanumanthaiya
2. K. Pattabhiraman
3. Mali Mariyappa
4. J. Mohamed Imam
5. B. N. Boranna Gowda
6. A. Bheemappa Naik
7. B. Narayanaswamy
8. Sirasappa Ijari
9. G. Duggappa
10. M. Rajasekhara Murthy

with a direction that the report be presented during this session.”

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER.—As required by Rule 90-B, the Minister for Law is nominated as a Member of the Joint Select Committee. The House will now rise and meet again at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

*The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Thursday, 13th October 1955.*